

O - Mex

2/18/71

Dear Paul, (Jim)

Time binds more tightly. When I finish something, instead of that being past, two things have happened. Jim Lesar has a clear xerox of the original of my responses in CA2569-70 should you want a copy after reading. He can have it done for 4¢ per page, x22x which may be better and cheaper than sending it out and back. 110 pp. Suggest there is no rush and eventually you can read first and see if you want.

Before hoping there will be time to attack each thing in your 2/14, ailing, let me mention what I recall. Correct on Sprague. No retelling of which I know by Sylvia. She is the second one to mention it to me, not the first. However, she did it as a question, not a statement. No rush on any of the copying for me. Suit your own convenience. I've written Whitten. Don't expect him to do a lot of work. They rarely have time. I was a mistake to make any mention of the unpublished and withheld, otherwise an excellent letter. What you should in the future bear in mind is their awareness that they are being used which is, to them, offset by their need to fill a daily column, which requires dependence upon those who use. It is something like sex. For it to be good, it takes two. If he responds, I'll keep you posted. I haven't gotten Jim's of 2/10.

There was a time when those nasty cracks, in this case "turgid", got to me. Now I not only don't care but have come to realize they are professional prerequisites. They provide "balance" and "impartiality" for the reviewer. That one was so turned on he spent much of a lunch with the Random House p.r. director raving about FRAME-UP.

N.O. clippings: we are all getting bogged down. I suggest you forget about making any for me. If you do make such a list, I can later ask from that. Thanks. While I'd like to have a complete file, at this point I think the other things we can do with the time and cost seem to be more worth both...On the copying again, even if it takes months, if it will either save time for you or be more meaningful for me to wait, do your notes first.

I am into much more than any of you know and there is never a problem of having priority work. The one exception would be what you might recall that is either medical or autopsy or relevant. As soon as I can I want to return to that writing. I don't know when that can be. I express hope only. Here it would be very helpful if Jim could take a crack at the Doyles for me. Sr. promised to make two copies for me in 12/68. If Jim can arrange this, I now have excellent facilities available, and I do not know how long that will last. I'd then feed back stills, etc, to them if they want and to you.

Before getting into your other enclosures, let me again try and impress something on you in a different way. My recollection is fading more daily as the number of involvement multiply and their complexities proliferate. In addition, with only slight reduction in my pace, this is inevitable, more at my age than at the age most of you enjoy. So, I'll have forgotten the details of some of your perceptive notes almost as soon as I comment. There are other and pressing things I must concentrate upon, and worries you neither have nor share (give thanks). I'll be filing your 2/14 on the subject under Oswald, "Mexico. If you write about it and I should refer to it, please remind me. I have a dozen filed into which it could properly go.

As a general practice, particularly now that I have formally charged "heads with perjury and worse, proven it, in court documents, I am the worst person to ask the A for anything. If Jim will nominate himself, I'd recommend him for handling all of this with which you deal, and I strongly concur in restricting it to the three of us. I'll add comment when you ask or if you do not if it seems called for. We should get all the things you say, of most of which I'd forgotten.

However, I'm willing to do the bugging of State is: you prepare all I should know for me, with copies. And, perhaps instead of going to court, which is burdensome, I might be able to smoke it out other ways. But put me in a position to make the "identifiable" request and to know all that must. The one time I leaned on State hard they delivered beautifully

and they may remember that I paid them back by leaving them entirely alone and putting full steam on Justice only. I'll write the guy who responded to the letter to Rusk.

When you say "burnt up", do you mean original and copies or just the original, in Thermofaxing? For it to have burned, literally, somebody had to be exceptionally careless. I have such a machine and have always been able to retrieve the papers that wrap up on the reel, if sometimes damaged by the heat. This is a machine that requires hand attention. I know of no automatic model.

Don't be ashamed of missing things. You've just joined a non-exclusive fraternity. Here you could suggest another translation: an associate. Yours is more likely, but others should not be excluded. In addition to your reasons, why should LHO ask about Odessa? But, does the date entirely exclude Mr. 237? Need you assume a single visit by him?

What is fascinating is "The Soviet indicated that he did not know what to do with the American". The most obvious things would have been to suggest indulgence in sexual self-gratification, and they seem not to be reluctant to express themselves bluntly. Why, then, in this case, have any concern? And why should Suran have worried about his "problem"? She wasn't Dorothy Dix or Mother Goose. You should know and not repeat that "oberts is interested in this stuff. I can't imagine him doing the work necessary to learn about it, hence I presume he was primed. By whom, make your own guesses. There may be a Newsweek story some of these days."

Your 2/14 Anderson memo (filed here under him rather than plots)

Never assume these guys, any of them, will ever be careful. Always assume they will not or cannot be and be happy if they are. They just haven't time and few have the disposition. I recognize the possibility that it was LHO at ODIOs but believe it wasn't. I can help Jim on the Odio rundown, when he has put together what he has, and I'll do it as fast as I can once I get it....I see now that in my haste to write Whitten, I did not distinguish in my own mind between your memo and your letter. But I think the letter is one that would lead one like me to so interpret. I will keep you posted. I knew Pearson but don't know Anderson (Bud does and he has been spoken to about me by other correspondents) or Whitten. I knew Anderson before I knew her, and didn't like his drunken-bum, Hechtian carriage.

Re CE2943: the copy printed was edited to remove Liebel's notations. I also agree Jim is right, but the strangest thing is that when Simmons went over my Basic list to make what was still withheld, this was still included. It did little good to continue to withhold after I published it in some detail, but they did. I remember raising this with Kelley on our first meeting but have no recall of anything he said. I presume he said it amounted to nothing in their opinion. There is an excellent collateral point on this, the frivolity of the withholding. I discussed it with Machann, who confirmed my interpretation (O in NO, I think). Tell me whatever more you'd like me to find out, on a separate piece of paper, and when I see him again I'll ask. On Hemming, it was a casual mention on his part, beginning with his asking for Sylvia's description and he indicated the refuge was for a brief period only. It is this sort of thing for which they were jailed, wasn't it? And with the then-existing connections, you can see how Hall could have known all about the parents and pretend to be from them. Patrick is one of the more undependable sources. The formulation "second" Oswald is wrong. It is, really, as I put it, false. The first part of your conjecture is WW, ch 11, the second inferred there and in WWII and O in NO. No argument coming from me. What is also interesting is that there are other stories of the passing of money, two that come to mind are Arnold Lewis Kessler and Dean Andrews to me. Question: are they all fakes, so many people spontaneously making up the identical or similar stories or is something being cloaked by discrediting?

Hall-Masferer. Sylvia was running around with the brother of the present governor of Puerto Rico, then its Republican leader and leader of the Statehood movement. His name is Ferre. (both are wealthy). Hall had to have known something about Sylvia, intimate things, to have known this. The FBI masked it by bringing in Masferer. Need more? The reports don't begin to show it, but they really investigated and tested Sylvia. Does this explain Rowley's writing of Kelley's report? Hurriedly,